

## REMARKS

### Pending Claims

Assuming entry of this amendment, claims 1 and 3-15 are pending.

### Specification

The Examiner objected to the disclosure because, on pages 10-11, the call-out generation module is stated to be item 167 whereas, in Figure 1, it is shown as item 163.

The problem is in Figure 1 rather than in the disclosure. In particular, although paragraphs [0039] and [0040] mention the call-out generation module 167 and the secondary input module 163 separately, only the call-out generation module is shown in Figure 1.

The requested changes to Figure 1 are both within the application 160: First, the numbering of the call-out generation module is changed from 163 to 167. Second, the secondary input module 163 is added, pointing into the input interpretation module 164. The requested changes to Figure 1 bring the figure into conformity with the disclosure and add no new matter. Support for the requested drawing changes is found in paragraphs [0039] and [0040]. Paragraph [0039] also mentions the functional connection between the secondary input module 163 and the input interpretation module 164: "... the application 160 according to the invention includes a secondary input module 163. When this module 163 is activated, an input interpretation module 164 interprets data entry by the user..."

### Claim Rejections –35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5 and 9-15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,526,232 (*Mizumura*). The Examiner wrote that *Mizumura* teaches, along with the other features of original claim 1, "associating with the primary graphical input device at least one predetermined non-graphical, secondary input action by keyboard (See Fig. 1, item 26, in description See Col. 3, Lines 24-45) corresponding to secondary input by user of the value of the respective input parameter

(See Fig. 7, items 230, 232, 234, 24, 26, in description See from Col. 8, Line 64 to Col. 9, Line 5)."

With reference to claim 2, the Examiner wrote that *Mizumura* "teaches the steps of generating on the display a secondary graphical input device upon sensing user initiation of any secondary input action, and displaying within the secondary graphical input device data entered by the user as the secondary input action (See Fig. 7, items 230, 232, 234, 24, 26, in description See Col. 9, Lines 1-15)."

The grounds for rejecting claims 1 and 2 are mentioned here together because both refer to the key difference between *Mizumura* and the applicants' invention as recited in the amended claim 1, which combines the limitations of original claims 1 and 2, with some rewording to maintain consistency of terminology. This is explained below.

As *Mizumura's* Figure 7 shows, and as is described in the section of *Mizumura* cited by the Examiner, *Mizumura* does have two different types of graphical input devices for setting each of the parameters zoom, focus and iris. These are the scroll bars 224, 226, and 228 and corresponding sliders ("digital input parts") 230, 232, and 234, respectively. To set the camera's zoom, focus and iris the user can either move a button 224A, 226A, 228A on the appropriate scroll bar, or type numerical values directly into the fields 230, 232, and 234. The slider is used for coarse adjustments whereas the fields can be used for precise numerical adjustment.

*Mizumura's* scroll bars 224, 226, and 228 and digital input parts 230, 232, and 234 are *always* displayed – *both* of them. In addition to Figure 7, see, for example, col. 8, lines 4-8:

Scroll bars 224, 226, and 228, and digital input parts 230, 232, and 234 are displayed at the center of the zoom operation part 204, the focus operation part 206, and the iris operation part 208, respectively.

There is no suggestion anywhere in *Mizumura* that the scroll bars might ever be displayed without the digital input parts also being displayed, or vice versa; rather, *Mizumura* explicitly indicates that both types of graphical input devices are displayed whenever the operations screen 200A is active. See, for example, col. 9, lines 12-15:

If the positions of the scroll boxes 224A, 226A, and 228A of the scroll bars 224, 226, and 228 are changed, the values in the digital input parts 230, 232, and 234 are correspondingly changed, *and vise-versa* (sic) (emphasis added).

It would not be possible, or meaningful, for a value entered in one type of device (scroll box or digital input part) to be reflected in the other unless both were displayed.

The user of *Mizumura's* lens control unit might find one type of graphical input device to be more convenient than the other, but both are always visible and available for selection using the mouse 24 – the scroll boxes 224A, 226A, and 228A of the scroll bars 224, 226, and 228 are dragged (col. 8, lines 37-38), which involves holding down a mouse button, and the user "clicks" into the digital input parts 230, 232, and 234 (col. 8, lines 65-67). There is no teaching anywhere in *Mizumura* that any particular action is ever required on the part of the user (other than selecting the operations screen 200A) to cause the system to generate and display either type of input device – both devices (scroll boxes and digital input parts) are always displayed so that they can be dragged or clicked into.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of previous claim 2 such that the secondary graphical input device is generated on the display "*upon* sensing user initiation of any secondary input action." Claims 12 and 14 have been similarly amended. Thus, the user must take some specific action before the secondary graphical input device is displayed at all. Support for this limitation is found, for example, in paragraph [0041], which also describes some of the advantages of suppressing display of the secondary graphical input device until the user takes some other action:

In the preferred embodiment of the invention, however, the module 167 generates the call-out only after the user selects -- activates -- a primary graphical input device and takes any predetermined, valid secondary action -- not immediately generating the call-out reduces on-screen distraction to the user and the operation of [the] invention becomes more transparent, less obtrusive, and retains the look and feel of the existing GUI as much as possible.

*Mizumura* teaches two separate but linked *primary* input devices, whereas one of the input devices in the applicants' invention is truly secondary in that it is displayed

only when specifically activated, that is, only upon sensing a secondary input action on the part of the user. *Mizumura's* system doesn't "care" which input action a user takes since both types of devices (scroll bars 224, 226, and 228 and digital input parts 230, 232, and 234) are always displayed and adjustment of one causes adjustment of the other. Adjusting a slider might be easier in many cases than inputting numbers, but both options are always visible and available to *Mizumura's* user.

In contrast, the secondary graphical input devices of the applicants' invention are *subordinate* to the primary devices. Using the applicants' invention, it would be possible for a user to work without ever even seeing a secondary input device (such as a call-out) – as long as he performs only primary input actions, the system according to the invention would not be prompted to generate and display any secondary input device. As pointed out in paragraph [0041] (quoted above), this reduces distraction and display clutter.

Claims 1, 12, and 14 as amended therefore recite a feature not found in *Mizumura*, a feature that has noticeable advantages for the user. The applicants therefore respectfully submit that these claims, as well as all claims that depend from them and recite further limitations to the invention, should therefore now be allowable.

### **Claim Rejections –35 U.S.C. §103**

#### **Claim 6**

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mizumura* because of obviousness. The Examiner wrote, in pertinent part:

*Mizumura* teaches three values input by the user into secondary graphical input device and three parameters associated with corresponding displayed portion of the primary graphical input device ...

*Mizumura* does not show if the number of values input is greater than number of parameters, subdividing an adjustable displayed of the primary graphical input device into a number of displayed adjustable portion corresponding to the number of values input; and if the number of values input is less than the number of parameters, joining corresponding ones of the adjustable displayed portions.

First, the applicants respectfully submit that claim 6 should now be allowable as being dependent on amended claim 1. Even so, the applicants point out that it would

make no sense for a lens control unit such as *Mizumura's* to allow for multiple simultaneous entries of any of the parameters controlled by either type of graphical input device (scroll bars 224, 226, and 228 and digital input parts 230, 232, and 234) – *Mizumura's* input devices are intended solely to control the zoom, focus, and iris of a camera. It is not physically possible for a camera lens to be zoomed to, focused on or have its aperture (iris) set to two different values at the same time. Of course, adjusting these parameters might create a depth of field in which objects in a distance range are in focus, but even this involves single-value settings of focus and aperture. Accordingly, there would be no need for "split input" of either of *Mizumura's* graphical input devices. Because the values are never split in *Mizumura*, there will also be no need ever to join them.

Also with reference to claim 6, the examiner wrote:

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that these adjustments of an adjustable displayed portion of the primary graphical input device (joining or subdividing) in *Mizumura* apparatus will require complete redesign of the primary graphical input device with user consent.

If anything, this is an argument *for* the allowability of claim 6: Even assuming it would be physically meaningful in an optical system (which it isn't), and even assuming either of *Mizumura's* input devices are "primary" in the sense of the applicants' (which neither is), then *Mizumura's* primary graphical input device would have to be completely redesigned (in a manner not needed by or taught in *Mizumura*) before it would even begin to resemble the applicants' invention as claimed. In short, *Mizumura's* teaching would have to be replaced by the applicants', which in itself argues against the notion that the applicants' invention as defined in claim 6 is obvious in view of *Mizumura*.

#### Claim 8

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mizumura* in view of Amro, et al. (US Patent No.5, 950,216). In particular, the Examiner wrote: "It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use a page-selection scroll bar of word-processing program; and the parameter is a page number as shown by Amro et al. in *Mizumura* apparatus and

method."

The applicants respectfully disagree. First, as with claim 6, the applicants submit that claim 6 should now be allowable as being dependent on amended claim 1. Moreover, again, *Mizumura's* input device devices (scroll bars 224, 226, and 228 and digital input parts 230, 232, and 234) are intended solely to control the zoom, focus, and iris of a camera. Single-valued physical parameters such as optical zoom, focus, and aperture would never need to be arranged into "pages" at all.

#### Claim 7

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mizumura* in view of Asmuth (US Patent No. 5,261,093). In particular, the Examiner stated that, although *Mizumura* does not show a query parameter in a database analysis routine, it would have been "obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to a query parameter in a database analysis routine as shown by Asmuth et al. in *Mizumura* apparatus and method."

As with claims 6 and 8, the applicants submit that claim 7 should now be allowable as being dependent on amended claim 1. Furthermore, the analysis applied above to claims 6 and 8 is relevant here: *Mizumura's* input device devices are intended solely to control the single-valued physical parameters zoom, focus, and iris of a camera. *Mizumura* does not suggest that selectable values for the these parameters would ever be arranged in any form of database. Indeed, it would be very unusual and clumsy to do so. *Mizumura's* input devices relate to values that a user would set given the immediate needs of a photographic or cinematographic session, for which there would be no need to "query" any database.

#### Conclusion

The applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims should now be allowable. First, the independent claims recite a feature not taught in *any* of the cited prior art (display of the secondary graphical input device only "upon sensing user initiation of [a] secondary input action." Consequently, no combination of any of the cited references would lead one skilled in the art to include this feature either. Not only do the

dependent claims inherit the limitation that makes their base claims allowable, but those dependent claims the Examiner specifically rejected recite features that would have no meaningful place or use with *Mizumura's* input devices – one skilled in the art would therefore not find it obvious to import these features into *Mizumura* from any of the secondary cited references. The applicants therefore respectfully request that all the claims still pending be allowed.

Thank you.

Date: 24 July 2003

34825 Sultan-Startup Rd.  
Sultan, WA 98294  
Phone & fax: (360) 793-6687

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jeffrey Pearce".

Jeffrey Pearce  
Reg. No. 34,729  
Attorney for the Applicant(s)

FIG. 1

